

**REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF SCOPING MEETING
RE: SDG&E'S PROPOSED SUNRISE POWERLINK PROJECT
CPUC/BLM SECOND ROUND OF SCOPING MEETINGS
FOR PREPARATION OF DRAFT EIR/EIS**

Held 6:30 p.m. February 7, 2007
At Alpine, California

Reported by:
Shannon L. Marcos, CSR No. 8348

STAFF PRESENTATION

Lewis Michaelson - Katz & Associates, Public Facilitator
Billie Blanchard - California Public Utilities Commission
Susan Lee - Aspen Environmental Group
Lynda Kastoll - Bureau of Land Management

Presentation: pages 3 to 9
Public Comments begin on page 9

PUBLIC COMMENTS, BY SPEAKER

Mr. Thometz 10
Mr. Uhu..... 11
Mr. Shackelford 11
Ms. Buxton 12
Mr. Caldwell 13
Ms. Manning 13
Ms. Gaul 14
Mr. Jennings 14
Ms. Jennings 15
Mr. Healy 15
Mr. Myrick 15
Mr. Flynn 16
Mr. Bretz 16
Ms. Barling 17
Mr. Trafecanty 18
Mr. Rusch 19
Ms. Akers 19
Ms. Myrick 20
Mr. Elliott 20
Mr. Lutz 21
Ms. Davis 21

STAFF PRESENTATION

MR. MICHAELSON: It's pretty obvious that a lot of people have a lot of very specific questions about where their property falls on a specific map, and we could probably spend another hour just doing that, so what we decided to do instead is let's go ahead and get the meeting started and the staff is more than willing to stay after the meeting to go back to the stations, go back to the maps and answer specific and individual's questions. But it may just turn out that during the presentation you get what you needed anyway and that way we could take care of everybody right now. So if I can ask people to take their seats. There's actually quite a few seats left, you just have to get cozy with your neighbor.

Thank you very much for coming here tonight. My name is Lewis Michaelson and I've been asked to moderate all of the scoping meetings for this round and, actually, I moderated all of them for the first round of scoping meetings. I work with the Aspen Environmental Group, who is preparing this document on behalf and in collaboration with the two agencies that are responsible, the California Public Utilities Commission and the Bureau of Land Management. As you can see by the title slide up here, and hopefully everybody got a copy of the presentation when they came in. In case it's difficult for you to see, you can follow along with that. Everything you got when you came in, if you didn't already have it, is the notice with all the maps. There will be number of references to the maps and, again, it will make it easier for you to follow. When Susan gets to those, she'll reference it Figure 1 or 2 or 5 and you can turn to it and make it easier to follow along.

This is actually, I think, this is our sixth meeting so far this week. We've already been out to El Centro and Wynola, Boulevard this afternoon, we've been to Rancho Peñasquitos and Ramona and we've had great attendance at all of them. I think we've had between 50 and 80 people. And I think we may have broken the record here tonight. It looks like about 100 people.

I mentioned this is the second round of scoping meetings and we know in particular that in Boulevard and in Alpine the closest meetings were really either Mission Valley or all the way out in El Centro, I guess, if you wanted to go over the hill to Ramona or Borrego Springs. But as you probably have learned there has been an evolution in the alternatives under consideration since that first round and has brought things a lot closer to home for the people who live along this corridor here. So even though the first round of scoping satisfied the requirements for the State under the California Environmental Quality Act and the requirements for scoping under the National Environmental Policy Act for the Federal Government, the Bureau of Land Management, there has been again so much evolution and changes that both agencies were encouraged to and felt the right thing to do was to come out and do a second round of scoping, focus on those new alternatives in particular, and to make sure that they went out to some of the new areas like Boulevard and Alpine where people may not have had the opportunity to come to the first set of scoping meetings, although I do see a number of you out there who I recognize from the first time and who came back.

The agenda today is I'm going to talk just briefly about the purpose of the second round of scoping. Then Billie Blanchard, who is seated in the middle there, with the California Public Utilities Commission is going to talk about their process review, as well as give a schedule update. That's changed a bit since the first round. Then Lynda Kastoll with the Bureau of Land Management will talk about the Bureau of Land Management's piece of this review process and decision-making. Then Susan Lee, again with the Aspen Environmental Group, is going to talk about the potential types of impacts that have been identified in the various links, I think with particular emphasis on this area. And Billie

will come up just briefly again to talk about how alternatives are screened, how they're added, how they're eliminated to understand how we got to where we are in the process here. And then, finally, Susan will go over specifically which alternatives have been carried forward, which ones have been added, and which ones have been eliminated at this point. At least that's the preliminary thinking about what they're going to propose. And this is important to evaluate in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the Draft Environmental Impact Report. That document has not been prepared yet. Ordinarily when you come out for a second set of meetings it would be because the document had already been prepared. It hasn't, so if you're looking for answers on conclusions about impacts, that analysis has not been completed in any way, shape or form yet. So keep in mind that we're still early in the process from that standpoint.

After that we'll get to what's the most important part of this evening which is an opportunity for you to comment in person face to face with the people who are doing the review, and we look forward to hearing from all of you who want to do that.

The purpose of this second round of scoping is to inform the public and the agencies about the alternatives proposed for full analysis in that draft joint document, the EIS and the EIR. Second is to inform you about the environmental review process and schedule. Third, and this is important, to solicit your inputs regarding the alternatives to the proposed project, which ones you think are right to include, which ones you thought should be included, et cetera. And, finally, after this part of the scoping phase, a second alternative scoping report will be prepared and placed on the project web site for all of you to see.

One thing that seems to get lost somewhere in the space of each one of these meetings is who is here and who is not here. So I always like to make this very clear that while San Diego Gas & Electric is the project proponent, they're the ones that are Applicant that brought this proposal forward, they're not a part of this proceeding and that's not who's seated at this table in front of you. These are the agencies and their consultants who are responsible for evaluating that application and doing that review, so if you keep that in mind when you're making your comments up, that might be helpful.

Let's see, I think we're ready for the next one then which is for Billie Blanchard to talk to you about the CPUC process.

MS. BLANCHARD: Good evening. Briefly I just want to go over a couple of things about the process in your schedule. First of all, the CPUC has two parallel review processes for the application which includes the general proceeding portion and the environmental review portion which we're here tonight to talk about.

The general proceeding is being led by Commissioner Dian Grueneich and Administrative Law Judge Steve Weissman. The scope of the CPCN proceeding is defined by our Public Utilities Code Section 1002 in which includes the determination for the need of the project, considering community values, aesthetics, historic, park, et cetera, and the review of the environmental impacts of the project.

The schedule for the general proceeding has been underway, the application has been filed. There have been several prehearing conferences both in Ramona. A scoping memo went out for the general proceeding in November of 2006 and that basically outlined the issues and schedule for the proceeding with the administrative law judge. There was a ruling recently that somewhat modified that schedule in January 2007. There will be testimony exchanged and that starts in January of 2007 and proceeds on into the proceeding. There are evidentiary hearings that will be held beginning July 9th,

2007. An ALJ proposed decision is scheduled to be out in December of 2007, and a final decision by the PUC by January of 2008.

We finally have a schedule for our environmental review and that is referenced on Page 2 of your notice that you may have received. The things that now we've done, we did a first round of scoping in general in October of 2006. We are now doing a second round of scoping that is involved mainly in the alternatives that we are thinking of carrying forward and those which we're proposing to eliminate, and that scoping period is January 24th to February 24th, 2007. We will have a second scoping report that will be available for people to obtain and review that will include everything that has gone on in the second scoping. That will be March of 2007. We're proposing to release the draft of this document on July 13th, 2007. And then there will be a 90-day comment period on this document from July 13th to July — yeah, October 12th, 2007, sorry. The final document is proposed to be released in November of 2007. And certification by January 2008.

Now I'll turn it over to Lynda Kastoll from BLM.

MS. KASTOLL: Good evening. BLM is involved in this project because SDG&E submitted an application to us to cross BLM lands for the purpose of building Sunrise Powerlink Project from Imperial Valley to San Diego. Approximately 31 miles in Imperial County and approximately 1.3 miles in San Diego County are affected by the proposed project. BLM is also responsible for a 26-mile right-of-way across Anza-Borrego. This came about because of a federal power project back in 1924 and in 1955 BLM issued that right-of-way for continuation of that right-of-way. So that right-of-way is under our jurisdiction as well.

BLM will also be considering a plan amendment to our California Desert Conservation Area Plan, because the proposed project deviates from our utility corridors designated in that plan.

BLM is also responsible for the coordination and consultation with other federal agencies such as BIA, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, DOD, Forest Service, and interested Native American Tribes.

The EIS/EIR will be used by BLM to help us to make our decisions and whether or not to amend our desert plan and whether or not to issue San Diego Gas & Electric right-of-way. It is anticipated that our Record of Decision will be issued in January of 2008 as well.

MS. LEE: Thanks. Again, I'm Susan Lee with Aspen Environmental Group and we are here to help the lead agencies prepare an environmental report that looks at the impacts of Sunrise Powerlink Project that SDG&E has proposed and also looks at alternatives to that project. So what I want to show first is what it is that's actually been proposed by SDG&E, because I know from talking to people in the back it's not so clear that which of all those many lines on all of those maps is the baseline for comparison. So if you have your handout with you, the Notice, Figure 1 in there is the one to look at. And I'll talk from this map and try not to block your view. Figure 1 shows two lines. There's a blue line on the right-hand side and a red line on the left-hand side. The blue line is a 500 kV high voltage transmission line that SDG&E would build from basically the El Centro area up through the desert through about 25 miles of Anza-Borrego Desert State Park and then down in through central San Diego County passing through the areas of Santa Ysabel, Ramona, Rancho Peñasquitos, Scripps Ranch, and out to the Peñasquitos Substation almost on the coast. So that transmission line route is what everything is being compared to.

The law under the California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Policy Act, which is what we're preparing these documents to comply with, requires that we look at alternatives. And the way that we do that is we look at the impacts of the proposed project.

There are a couple of other components of the proposed project. In addition to the transmission line, there's a major new substation that would be built in the area of San Felipe just outside of Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. There is a reconductor segment where an existing tower would be reconducted with new lines. There are substation upgrades. And there is a part what we're calling future phases, because SDG&E's project involves a construction of a substation up here that's big enough for two additional 230 kV lines in addition to the one that's actually being evaluated now because it is reasonably foreseeable that those lines might follow this one. In this document we're going to describe as much as we can and it is speculative, we don't know what and when it will be, but we'll do our best to make sure that the public and the decision-makers who have to think about this project know that it's likely that a substation here would ultimately result in other lines.

We have several slides here, and you have these in your handouts, that talk about the major impacts of the proposed route. I'm going to focus really on just one thing, because that's pretty much why we're here. We've got slides in there that talk about the impacts in the desert, the impacts in Anza-Borrego, the central area, inland valley and the coast. The reason that we're here primarily is because of Anza-Borrego. Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, as you know, is the biggest park in the state of California and it extends north/south almost all the way down to the border. SDG&E has proposed to build this line through the park, following an existing corridor of 69 kV lines which are now on wood poles. Those would be replaced with the large steel poles similar to the Southwest Powerlink that runs down here along the border. It basically would go through the heart of the park near the campground, cultural resources, and actually having both direct and indirect impacts on wilderness through the park. So because of that we have been told to look at alternatives that do not go through the park and what that does is to force us to look at alternatives that would parallel the Southwest Powerlink.

So that takes us through a discussion of really project impacts. And I'll come back in just a little bit and talk about what the alternatives are in a little more detail.

MS. BLANCHARD: Okay. Just briefly the EIR/EIS process. We are still at the scoping period and the screening of alternatives. And this is the second scoping period, of course, that we're having on alternatives and receiving input from the public.

We use the CEQA/NEPA criteria for screening alternatives that has been listed in that detailed notice. There's a lot of detailed discussion about the methodology that is utilized for determining a reasonable range of alternatives. It's on Page 6 through 9 of that notice.

There are three main criteria that are used for screening alternatives. One is the consistency with most or all the project objectives. We've utilized the three main objectives, which was for maintaining reliability, access of renewables, and economic benefit. The second major thing is the ability to reduce or avoid significant impacts of the proposed project. And we are identifying those through our impact analysis of the team through agency consultations, the applicant's PEA, data requests, and scoping comments. Feasibility: The third most important criteria is technical feasibility, regulatory feasibility and legal feasibility.

The sources of the alternatives that we have presented in the notice include alternatives suggested in the scoping comments which has been considerable. Reconsideration of SDG&E's PEA

alternatives and also SDG&E's alternatives that they eliminated in their PEA. And alternatives that through the CPUC processing of filings and the ISO alternatives process.

The types of alternatives that we have been considering and also that are in the notice include link and route alternative segments, substation alternatives, the Southwest Powerlink alternatives, the full project route and system alternatives, as well as in-basin generation and other non-wire alternatives.

So now Susan will talk more specifically about those alternatives.

MS. LEE: Thanks. Again, we're going to skip through the next four or five slides. You have them in your handout, but what these slides show link by link is they list specific alternatives that would replace small pieces of this line along the proposed route, so in areas where we've identified a particular resource issue or a pocket of residences or a highly visible area, we've looked for small routes that could replace that segment but still remain along the proposed project corridor. So a great number of the alternatives that are listed in your handout are those.

What we'll go on to here is the Southwest Powerlink alternative. Look at Figure 8 in the handout that you have, and I'll put that map up here as well. As I mentioned earlier, the Southwest Powerlink alternatives came about for two reasons — well, several reasons. The number one reason was that there were a huge number of comments when this project was originally proposed. And I'm sure you've heard a lot about this because it's been in the paper for the last couple of weeks about looking for alternatives that avoid Anza-Borrego. That's No. 1. The other one is that people are suggesting rather than create a major new high voltage corridor through the county, an existing corridor should be looked at. And the two that were suggested by many, many people, one is the existing Southwest Powerlink, which is the high voltage 500 kV line that runs down along the border, and the second one is Interstate 8. So the Interstate 8 corridor was presented as a possibility. So we looked at everything we could find down here. We've done the best we can at avoiding residences.

And what we have identified at this point are four alternatives that are possible, we're calling them the Southwest Powerlink Alternatives, because they would all require (you have to imagine Imperial Valley Substation way back here) about 37 miles of co-location with the Southwest Powerlink, so there would be a line built right next to this up until this point. The first two alternatives would separate from the Southwest Powerlink just southeast of Boulevard. One would follow Interstate 8 almost all the way into the east end of Alpine. At that point it has two options; one would be to go straight north through the forest, the other one would be to underground converted to a 230 kV line and underground through Alpine/Boulevard, right out to the far west end of Alpine, where it would connect with this what's called the West of Forest Alternative, which I'll talk about in a second. So that's the Interstate 8 Alternative.

This other one is called BCD and this was developed, we made a request to SDG&E to look for a route that consciously avoided any residential areas. So the BCD Alternative, which is sort of a brownish red line, goes through BLM land and then into the forest and follows national forest land, again, going north a mile or two west of Descanso and up through the edge of the forest between the Capitan Grande Reservation and Boulder Creek and all the way up to Santa Ysabel.

The other two alternatives that we have on the table for the Southwest Powerlink alternatives, they're two that would follow 52 miles of the Southwest Powerlink leaving it just south of Campo. And there are two alternatives that would follow an existing transmission line across the south end of the forest. And then one would go up what's called Route D by diverging from it. And I know a lot of

people have heard about this route that followed SDG&E's existing wood pole line through the Japatul Valley. What we've done because of the intense number of residents in there and in the Descanso area is we've moved that line to the west. And we have — I know a lot of you have looked at those detailed maps in the back. It basically goes into the forest to the west of the more developed area all the way up again to Santa Ysabel.

And then this final one, and I know a lot of you are here because of that alternative, one of the other suggestions that we got from many people during scoping was that it looked as though the project and alternatives was being focused on land that was being protected in some way, that it was either designated as national forest or park lands, and that we should look for an alternative that doesn't have so many direct impacts to protected areas. A couple of people have told us today, and we have also heard from the County, that there are other open space preserves along here that we haven't got marked and that's something that we're working on researching and anything you could tell us would be great. But that's what this purple line is called the West of Forest Alternative. And this one would reconnect with the proposed project in the area of Sycamore Canyon just off of Highway 67.

There are two other categories of alternatives that have been very important to most people because these are alternatives in which a new major transmission line would not be built at all, but that alternatives that would still meet the major three objectives that Billie mentioned which are bringing in renewable power, reliability of electricity, and reducing regional electricity costs.

The first one is Transmission System Alternatives. The major alternative we're looking at in this category is the Lake Elsinore Advanced Pump Storage Project, otherwise known as LEAPS. This is a project that includes, in addition to a hydroelectric generation project, it includes a 30-mile 500 kilovolt transmission line primarily in the Cleveland National Forest that connects the Southern California Edison and San Diego Gas & Electric territories, so it allows those three objectives to be met in a very different way and obviously in a very different area.

The second one is a much smaller alternative. The Mexico Light is an alternative that would allow a improvement in reliability by a very short transmission upgrade actually in Mexico. We would use that possibly in combination with other transmission alternatives to meet that reliability objective.

And the third one is Path 44. This is an alternative that also would benefit San Diego but, in fact, with transmission upgrades would be within the Southern California Edison system in Orange County allowing import of power into San Diego.

The other category of alternatives we're looking at, and this is another one that we heard many, many requests for when we were out doing scoping in October, is non-wires alternative. And this is a category of alternatives in which would be a combination of renewable power. And the first one we would look at would be entirely renewable, the extent to which solar power, wind power, biomass and biogas could be used to meet the generation objectives that provide reliability to the region. And then in combination with that the other bundles that are listed there would add on to that in-basin generation, the South Bay Power Plant.

The third one adds not only South Bay Power Plant, but the ability to use renewable energy certificates, which would allow trading of renewable energy rather than building a transmission line to access renewable energy. Basically it's like a market for renewable energy.

That's the end of the alternatives discussion. We'll go now to comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much for your kind attention. Hopefully that gave everyone in the room a good broad overview of the types of alternatives that are being looked at in this area. And also some of the, as Susan mentioned, some of the non-wires or ways of achieving it without doing the transmission link that was proposed in the original proposal from San Diego Gas & Electric. That's why in terms of your comments tonight, if you want them to be the most useful and have the most impact, they would be that if you address what you see up there, one, if you agree or disagree with the alternatives that have been proposed for retention or elimination. And more importantly why would you agree or disagree. And second of all, do you have any further suggestions or modifications to those alternatives, or even yet, new alternatives that have not yet been considered. So the degree to which you can focus on the alternatives, that's really where the analysis is at this point.

We know that the vast majority of people in the U.S. survey after survey says are deathly afraid of public speaking, that's why we both provide the opportunity to come up one on one at the poster stations. And, again, will do that after this meeting as well. That's also why we provide the ability to send in written comments. And as was mentioned, February 24th is the deadline for sending those in. There are written comment sheets at the desk, you probably got them when you came in. If you want to fill those out and hand those in tonight, you can save yourself the postage. Otherwise, you can use that or send in as extensive or voluminous comments as you want through the U.S. Mail. Just keep in mind that February 24th deadline.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is that a post-marked deadline?

MR. MICHAELSON: Correct, February 24th.

The web site is available. The California Public Utilities Commission has its own web site that deals with this project. And as far as keeping track of regulatory review and analysis, that's really the web site that you should be going to make sure you're getting straight and up-to-date information. If you don't have access for whatever reason, there are also almost 30 information repositories at libraries and offices throughout the region that you can see copies of these materials in hard copy. Hopefully you're already on the mailing list. If you're not, please sign in and you will be. You'll get future notices so that you'll be kept apprised of what's happening.

If after today's meeting you think of further questions or clarifications, there's an e-mail address as well as an 800 toll free number that you can call. So hopefully the two agencies that made it as user-friendly as they possibly can for you to stay informed and be involved in this process.

So here we are. I've got right now in front me about 15 cards of people who have signed up to speak. I think Daniel is going to bring me some more. We've got a good start on this. If you decide that you do want to speak, if you don't mind going over and filling one out, we'll just keep adding to this list. And everyone has been using the same method at all the meetings, each person will have three minutes to speak. And I have a very sophisticated way of indicating times, that is, when there's one minute left, I'll put up my index finger like this, so if you look at me occasionally, it helps to keep track and that allows you to find a comfortable place to wrap up. And when your three minutes is done, I'll put up my closed hand like this indicating it's time to move on to the next speaker.

So with that, what I would like to do is call the first several names. This is a big room. Instead of making everybody sit up front, I'll just call your name. If you know when it's coming up, maybe

you can kind of be moving yourself into position. So the first name, I apologize if I can't read some of these, it looks like Anthony Allen Uhu, Michael Thometz, Gordon Shackelford, Cindy Buxton and Roger Caldwell. You'll be the first five speakers.

And if you would come on up, Anthony. And we don't need your address or serial number or any of that. All I need is your name.

And if I didn't mention it, seated to my left is a court reporter. She's here to make a verbatim transcript of everything that is said so it can be entered into the record. And written comments, again for those of you who don't feel comfortable as our friend Anthony does, are given just as much weight and consideration so don't feel like you've been left out if you don't speak tonight.

MR. THOMETZ: Do you want information about what your interests are?

MR. MICHAELSON: Sure.

MR. THOMETZ: My name is Mike Thometz. I live in Campo. I'm president of a group called Merit, which is a land use advocacy group for our area of the county. I'm also the habitat coordinator for San Diego County for Quail Unlimited. And I've worked in habitat projects in the entire area of the county, so I've been almost everywhere.

Since the energy crisis, like most people, I have a lot of suspicion about power companies, so you start out with that as a basis. So I look at this thing do we need it, where should it go, will it be used as advertised? And the first thing is that nobody has convinced me yet that we need it and we haven't seen that kind of analysis that we need it and particularly from an independent outside source. An independent outside source is looking at how it would — whether we need it and how it could be done if we do. That's coming down the road, so I think it's a little premature to decide on the routes right now.

The one route that I — I live on the border. I look at Sunrise Powerlink or the Southwest Powerlink every day, and I think that is the best route for it to go. There's already something there, and I've heard the arguments, well, you can't do it because of the fire danger. Well, what you could do to make a whole list of improvements is you could do fire clearing under that line so the fire would not be the risk that it is that you say you can't do it with. And think what else that would do, that would provide a big broad swath for enforcement of Border Patrol activities which we don't have now because they're going through brush.

There's a lot of land on the border that is BLM already. And what's not BLM is not occupied. A lot of it is for sale. To me that is a much better route than going through the park. It's shorter and more direct. So, you know, when I look at these 27 maps, you're trying to confuse people. There's so many lines on this thing that it's virtually impossible for everybody who is not a computer genius to figure out what's going on. It's very confusing.

But let's do something where there's already a line so you don't impact the state park and all these areas of population. You know, and there's so many issues here, like how does the solar issue with the state fit into the future demand? Are we, in fact, going to be able? Does this solar facility that you're going to put out here, nobody even knows if it's going to work. It's supposed to be the biggest in the world, but nobody knows if the thing is going to work or not. So we're putting things way ahead here.

You know, the last thing that really damages your credibility is the article where Mr. Avery says, “We don't want the South Bay Power Plant, we don't need it.” We don't need it, why do we have to bring in more energy.

We all know that in-basin generation is cheaper, so that should be the focus of the alternative. We should be doing non-wire things, more in-basin alternatives. And the other thing which bothers me is all of a sudden the savings which is supposedly going to be generated by this, the analysis now says, well, the savings aren't there, maybe it's going to be negative.

I think if you're going to get this done by 2008, you're going to be miracle workers, because there are more problems that have not even been addressed than just looking at a couple of places where it would go.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Did I skip Anthony?

MR. UHU: I'll pass.

MR. MICHAELSON: All right, then that brings us to Gordon Shackelford.

MR. SHACKELFORD: Yes. Gordon Shackelford. I don't have a position on any of the location alternatives. I believe the heart of what needs to be worked on is the non-wire and the system alternatives.

First off, I should tell you I've set up my home for photovoltaic power and make most of my electricity, so I'll make the point as I end alternative energy.

The first meeting, which I think was not a PUC meeting was an SDG&E kind of community leader meeting, I met with Mr. Avery, had a fair amount of conversation, ate lunch with him. And what I was concerned about from the get-go was the technology of the solar thermal electric, the Sterling Energy, and I said, “Geez, do you really think that's going to run?” Because the company really doesn't have any track record or anything, I think. What he said, “Well, it's not a problem.” I said, “It isn't?” And he says, “No, because we have a contract with them and if they don't produce any electricity, we don't pay them.” I said, “Whoa, but then you just built a \$1.4 million extension cord for nothing.” He said, “It will still work out because they've got a lot of geothermal out in Imperial Valley.” I said, “Yeah, very grimy stuff, how much do you think they got?” He came up with 6,000 megawatts. I said, “No, it's not that big.” And the point is on the geothermal it is speculative also to a degree particularly when it's grimy, but you deplete it locally as has happened on the geyser field in Northern California.

As far as I can see given the speculative nature if we take some moves in the right direction, the existing Southwest Powerlink would be plenty sufficient to bring in renewables from that area in Imperial Valley if indeed they develop. And I hope they do. So I'm very glad you have and what I support is some combination of the non-wire and system alternatives. And, in fact, I guess one reason I support it because actually the whole thing gets all the more tangled. You've heard all day about we don't need the power from the rebuilt South Bay Plant and the savings numbers are a problem as well.

I would suggest that rebuilding the — not only Encina plants, there's five of them, but also the South Bay, which are very inefficient with good combined cycled equipment moves us in the proper direction. And, frankly, the plan years ago was to use the same natural gas supply and quantity and simply make about 50 percent more electricity with it. I think that's where we need to go.

The LEAPS project is exceedingly important because it would excel at peaking, which the combined cycle is not all that red hot. So I'm really am glad you have the alternatives working in renewables. They have to be bundled, so they cannot be rejected piecemeal. But I think actually combining that with the systems alternatives and consider our route for alternatives be the Southwest Powerlink.

If I could, just one last comment. I think more recent activity of the PUC is to limit bringing in coal fired power into the state on new contracts, so now I start to wonder what exactly are we going to do with the Southwest Powerlink. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Next speaker is Cindy Buxton.

MS. BUXTON: Hi, my name is Cindy Buxton. I'm here partly on behalf of myself, partly on behalf of the Sierra Club. I've spent the last 10 years documenting the more remote areas and you might have noticed that the desert gets a lot of publicity, not as much back here because nobody knows it's there. And it's hard to tell from a distance, but this is your backyard and you own it right now. This is Cleveland National Forest and there are many places back there that are just as pristine and gorgeous.

I was asked to welcome Joel Anderson's staff that I believe is here that are represented in this area. One thing I will mention is when I was a waitress the one way I used to get you to buy dessert was I didn't say do you want dessert, I said do you want apple pie or cheese cake. And I think that it's no secret that the Sierra Club doesn't want dessert. We don't want a power line at all. It's not about whether it's going to be here or there or in Ranchita or in Alpine. I would be horrified about either one. And I think we should oppose this power line altogether.

As a Sierra Club environmentalist I'm not really a very good banner waver. I'm a little shy for that, but I do take kids hiking and that's probably the best way I do activism. Most recently I took a kid that had never been off the pavement but he was in really good shape and we took him to Eagle Peak. And he was so stoked that two days later he went back to Three Sisters, and this about three-quarters of a mile from where the power line would go. That was a really good day. I got into that, got into the whole thing because when I was eight-years-old and I was a kid I lived in the foot hills of South Carolina and that was approximately 1965 and I saw 300 feet of water get put over the Toxaway Horsepasture River and I saw not only homes and little shacks get torn down, but a whole culture was eliminated. And it feels like we're being treated by deliverance here. They would put this power line over people's houses and take their houses away. What Duke Power did then was made a whole lot of money out of real estate that they had around the lake that they built when they took other people's houses away. And it led me to a lot of distrust with the power company. And I think that we need to be working together as a team to solve the energy problems and this is creating a lot of public distress, distrust in the public system.

I point out that you keep mentioning which open space, which forest, which state property should we use, we own that, you own it right now. We don't own SDG&E. They would take it from you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

Let me read ahead again. Next speakers are Roger Caldwell, Mary Manning, Suzanne Gaul, John Elliott and Brian Jennings.

MR. CALDWELL: Thank you for having the meeting this evening. My name is Roger Caldwell. I'm a homeowner and landowner up in Crest. I'm going to give sort of a specific personal gripe of what's going on here, and that's actually that the alternate route is being proposed that goes over the mountain top between Harbison Canyon specifically on your map here in the areas between WF-19 and WF-20. Even until this evening is the only time I've been able actually to see where the route is. This package, I'm sorry that somebody paid for this because it was a waste of money, a lot of it. Basically my gripe is that the hillside that they're trying to go over or the mountain they're trying to go over is so steep that it's an absurd consideration to put actually in power lines going up over the top of mountain there. There are boulders the size basically of dump trucks. There are round boulders up there that could easily become dislodged and knock out a power line. So not to mention the fact that I own about 80 acres of land and my neighbors here own surrounding areas, too. Our back areas are all preserved. We basically work together to basically keep a good habitat for all the animals. And, frankly, the fire that came through, the Cedar Fire was devastating, but our lives, you know, animals and stuff are coming back now.

I have a real problem here is that it's not safe putting that over the mountain. The existing 69 kV road that goes across through the existing pole line, the yellow line on the map behind me, they haven't properly maintained that road even. My neighbors and I have griped for several years about the independent contractors that they hired to come out and regrade the road so they can get a service truck through. They grade it differently every time and just it's poor quality. And I won't even take your one minute. Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Mary Manning.

MS. MANNING: Hi, Mary Manning. I wear many hats. I'm president of the Harbison Canyon Lions Club and the only reason I'm saying that is besides community service, we have been very active since the 2003 Cedar Fire helping families without insurance rebuild homes. I also am very active with the Harbison Canyon Community Board. One of my jobs has been working for three years to get the fire station that burned during in the Cedar Fire rebuilt. And it has still not been rebuilt. And that is what I'm bringing up this evening is we live in — the area that I'm looking at in the map is WF-18. We have minimal fire service with what's called San Diego Rural Fire Protection District. The fire protection in our community is actually volunteer based with at present no fire station. The district headquarters is in Jamul, which is a good 35, 40 minutes away from our community. When the Cedar Fire came through and burned our community, we had no fire service in the canyon. And even to this day when CDF comes to talk about fire prevention and stuff, they have told us that canyon, they do not feel it's safe to put personnel in to fight a fire. The only alternatives we have in case of a wild fire is aerial protection. You put this kind of a project through our community we will have even less fire protection than we have now. In the 2003 Cedar Fire we lost 300 of 400 homes. I don't think it's fair that you once again take — you know, here's an electric alternative that will take the fire service, even more fire service away from our community. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Suzanne Gaul.

MS. GAUL: Hi, my name is Suzanne Gaul and I'm standing here before you to express my opposition to the Sunrise Powerlink Project. I'm appalled at especially the West of Forest Alternative, Route D. That route goes directly through my backyard. The access road is 50 feet from my house. The first pole is 160 feet from my house and with this new proposal with a 230 kV line, they're going to end up having to buy up my house possibly and definitely my yard.

I live above Harbison Canyon. In reference to one of the gentleman it's very steep terrain. They can't even maintain the power poles that they have currently. And there is, you know, rocks that continuously fall. There are several creeks that are, you know, two, 300 feet down a mountain side that wipe out the roads that they can't take care of. Every time they come out and bulldoze with an out-of-state company or somebody up in Northern California, they redirect the water and wipe out parts of our property.

I want to suggest some alternatives. Definitely the no-action alternative, which nobody seems to be considering. Also the non-wire alternative to this project. And looking at alternatives like Encina and South Bay replacement project. Also the solar energy. I mean, SDG&E if they had to foot the bill on this, would be looking at alternative energy sources instead of those of us having to pay for it. And they would have 25, 30 years to do it. And they haven't taken the forethought to do anything like this.

Alternatives to the Route D. I would like to see looking at Dehesa Road going 3.1 miles connecting to the huge power poles that are above the Singing Hills Cemetery that head north across La Cresta heading to 8. There's also another route going — if we had to go through Harbison Canyon, going 3.1 miles all underground on those roads. And then also if we had to it's feasible to go underground along Tavern Road so that no homes are affected, no views are affected. They have the capability. They've done it in so many other areas.

Environmentally, we live a half a mile from a preserve. There is no magic door that shuts down. There's animals and people that go through that corridor all the time. A few years ago we had a bird land on a wire and he caused a fire in that area. That steep terrain has tons of wind that's affecting the wires. It's got, you know, the fire crews they call it indefensible space. There is no way they could take care of that. That fire would spread rapidly, and again, with no fire resources. We have eight miles are the closest fire stations to those areas.

We won't even get into health concerns. I know you heard it all. You have the power. You are representative hopefully of the people of California and you can say no to this project. I've read literally hundreds of letters when I didn't know anything about the project because it was so vague. Everything I've seen everybody needs to work together and say no to this project.

MR. MICHAELSON: Brian Jennings.

MR. JENNINGS: Hi, my name is Brian Jennings. I'm here primarily to speak in defense of the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. It kind of appears to me as though some of these alternatives are really kind of a red herring way to pretend like we're proposing something when really the goal is to just to go through Anza-Borrego after we've eliminated these possibilities.

I really kind of wanted to introduce you and through you to the rest of the CPUC and the BLM to my two sons, Brennan and Kenny, six and eight. And I've been taking them to Borrego Desert State Park since they were infants. And my parents took me since I was an infant and my brothers as well. We still go, the three generations of us. My parents left me a pretty pristine park to take my sons to. And I really think we need to leave these guys a pretty good park to take their sons to.

And my only other comment would be I think we could really solve this problem with the no-wire approach if we find a way to make millions of dollars for SDG&E through that approach. As long as they can get rich, I'm sure they will be glad to do it.

MR. MICHAELSON: Let me read ahead again. Our next speakers are Nancy Jennings, Paul Healy, Jeff Myrick, John Flynn and William Bretz.

MS. JENNINGS: That was my family you just met. I don't have a whole lot more to add to what's already been said, except to speak for the beauty of the park and the goal of the park service is to protect this beautiful resource as a legacy for future generations. This power line is not necessary. It's ugly. It's destructive. It's harmful. Please don't make the mistake of marring this park. Once you put this line up, this blithe is forever. It will never go away. And that is not protecting a legacy that we need to leave for our families and for the future.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Paul Healy.

MR. HEALY: I'm Paul Healy. I'm here to oppose all the alternatives except for the no wire. I think San Diego County has suffered enough environmental damage from all the other lines that crisscross the area.

I wanted to talk about the cost, though, too because the cost at 1.2 billion dollars spread out over the approximately one million homes in the county, it works out to over \$1,000 per house. And I think a good start would be for the no-wire alternative would be to buy each one of those houses \$1,000 worth of solar panels. And they can buy the electricity back from us and it gives us a discount on our bills. So I think — and that's just a start.

I think with all the sunlight that we have here, that we could probably generate all of the electricity that we need without importing anything. We can get off of this liquefied natural gas and all this other stuff. We don't have to go to war. We don't have to kill people for our fuel supplies and we don't have to die to protect our fuel supplies because we get it from the sun.

So let's go for a no wire. Forget all that destruction and keep this place as nice as we can.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you. Jeff Myrick.

MR. MYRICK: My name is Jeff Myrick and I too live in the community of Harbison Canyon. And I wanted to discuss the West of Forest Alternative route, in particular coverage of F16, 17, 18, 19 and 20. That basically puts the power lines on both the ridge lines of our community. And in the Cedar Fire our community and Crest lost over 500 homes. I talked to the CDF fire chief last night and putting these power lines in our community will affect fire protection for our community. They don't like putting fire crews underneath power lines to fight fires. It will basically eliminate any aerial aircraft drops because they can't drop near the power lines or on the power lines because it may cause the power lines to fall. So that basically limits us to helicopters in limited areas. And I think by putting these power lines in you're putting these two communities, Harbison Canyon and Crest, at great risk from another fire.

So I strongly hope that you reconsider where you run these lines. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: All right, thank you. John Flynn is next, I believe.

MR. FLYNN: Good evening everybody. I'm a retired marine and I've been working in the energy and environmental field since retiring from the Marine Corps in 1977. In fact, I worked for San Diego Gas & Electric for five years, 1980 to 1985, spent five years trying to get them to go solar. When I finally resigned to take a better job, they told me they wouldn't do that unless they could put a

meter on the sun. That was what they told me. And it's finally come that they're going to do something about it, but the question is how much or how little.

We really should be doing solar in San Diego County. We have a group together right now that's working on that and we're working on that real hard. Our approach to this is to put on town hall meetings for energy end users in California over the next six months to show them why they ought to ask their energy supplier and the CPUC why we can't do a rapid changeover to renewable energy. That's what we should be focused on.

Now, when I look at this particular project, I don't see many jobs in there for San Diego County residents. I don't see a lot of things that we could get out of energy work that we might do to make our climate and environment better and to save a lot of money. Fossil fuels are excessively and exceedingly expensive and they're getting much higher as they run out. We should be using readily available renewable energy.

I got my first introduction to renewable energy as a kid during the depression and World War II in Nebraska. Almost 100 percent of our energy came renewable and it wasn't that hard to get. We weren't that smart. We figured out how to get it and use it and it works real well. And it will be available to us until the sun burns out. That's where I'm coming from. And I think there may be some other people in here who have the same focus. There are quite a few of them in San Diego. Thank you for your time.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. The next speakers are William Bretz, Lesley Barling, Denis Trafecanty and Randy Rusch.

MR. BRETZ: Hi, I'm William Bretz. First I want to comment about your scoping process. I wish I could ask some questions because I don't believe that the documents that really have been provided have enough information for people really don't know what's going on. For instance, and I know you probably can't answer these questions.

MR. MICHAELSON: But if you ask the questions, they can look at that in further documentation.

MR. BRETZ: I know. I think at this stage people need to be hearing things like how wide is a corridor, what happens when it goes along a property line, what's the setback people have in terms of not being able to make use of their property, or how close can you live to one of these things? None of that kind of information is in here. And you look at maps and you see the lines projected along paths and parcels. There's no clue as to what is the actual impact to the property owners. If you think about the impacts of these lines going, of course, they'll be analyzed in the EIS/EIR, but you aren't getting the response from the community, I don't believe, that you would get if more people understood what the impacts of these lines were going to be.

I have a very specific comment I want to make about a problem with the West of Forest Alternative. If you look at about WF-11 going north, that's passing through an area, that's the Sycuan Peak Sweetwater River Ecological Habitat Preserve. This is — a wildlife conservation board purchased the property that's been added to with a lot of mitigation purchases. These kinds of places are investments that the public has made in California for setting aside habitat. They weren't picked willy-nilly. They were picked because they have some of the best habitat resources there. And I believe that's a very particular impediment to this particular alternative. You follow it north and at WF-20 it's

running along the edge of the Crest Ridge Ecological Habitat Preserve. That's another one of these large investments for public and habitat for the future of California. And these corridors, that particular case along Crest Ridge isn't crossing the preserve, but it will be a corridor next to it that introduces invasive species and creates all sorts of problems for the biological resources there.

One other thing I want to say, first of all, I believe in the non-wire alternatives. I think they're very appropriate and the way to go. I think this project doesn't make much sense except for SDG&E.

In the newspaper SDG&E is quoted as saying something here to the effect of SDG&E customers pay just 10 percent of the project's cost and Avery says, "But we get the lion's share of the benefits." That offends me. They're saying that San Diego customers pay 10 percent of the cost and the rest of the state pays 90 percent of the cost. That's like gaming the system in my opinion. And I think it would be irresponsible of the agencies to allow SDG&E to get away with that.

Then the final thing I'm curious about is there's a whole other corridor project that the federal government is running called the West Wide Energy Corridor Program. And I don't know if you're aware of that or not, but it's based on the Homeland Security and the energy policy acts, and I'm wondering if there is going to be any consideration of this in the EIS/EIR?

MR. MICHAELSON: All right. Thank you. Lesley Barling.

MS. BARLING: Hi, I hoped to have slightly better organized set of comments, but I'm just going to hopscotch.

One difficulty I have on trying to understand the system alternatives is I can't really get clear between Figure 10 and the text and I'm not really clear. There's certain alternatives like a VRD Devers-Miguel in the North County that's mentioned in the text that I can't find on the map. And the generic criticism, I guess, or quandary I have about what's these system alternatives are that they're supposed to replace the Sunrise Powerlink is one shortfall of my understanding of exactly where they are. But the other is like the Devers-Miguel via Imperial just seems to be meandering all over the place so that, gee, its extra length causes it to be discarded.

And somebody else mentioned, you know, red herrings. Well, it's just like straw men, you're setting up routes that are begging to be discarded because of where they are. And I wonder if there can't be other pathways, something that goes up, for instance, on the west side of the Salton Sea, but along the Imperial County line outside Anza-Borrego and then turns and comes along the north side of Anza-Borrego, not through the wilderness area, but the boundary between them or using whatever the blue, maybe Devers, one of the Devers Ramona lines coming down through there into the North County. I don't understand why it has to go from Devers to Miguel.

The alternative routes that include, for instance, D and West of Forest that come parallel with the Southwest Powerlink, a lot of the discussions there is, oh, well, we want reliability, we want protection of the lines, therefore, we shouldn't have them paralleling the existing powerlink. And then you show these things that come and they're only about three miles, less than four miles separation from the powerlink, I'm referring to D and West of Forest, and that's no distance at all when you have a wild fire burning and mountain ridges that embers can blow between.

Anyway, what I want to see emphasized, like many other speakers here, are the non-wire alternatives. Conservation is one that maybe there's different jargon in the text, but that along with

alternative energy sources within the area of generation of power, shorter distribution fields, because you're producing things more locally. And, anyway, I'm out of time, I believe, so thanks.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Denis Trafecanty.

MR. TRAFECANTY: Denis Trafecanty. I'm in North County. I don't think it's about the maps that you all are looking at. It's right here, I'm opposed. I think it's about the entire concept. You've all said it.

I'm going to add a few comments and then I want to tell you why I'm really up here. First of all, picture a windstorm that creates a fire that's caused by an investor owned utility power line and figure the winds are 50 to 60 miles an hour and figure that the fire captain decided to hit the fire head on with an airplane hitting the fire head on. It was a successful hit. He put the fire out. This occurred two months ago in North County and if that didn't happen, there would have been a lot more homes burned just recently up in the North County. Now picture that happening down here or anywhere where there's a 160-foot tower, this would not have happened. This plane that's putting out this fire would not have occurred if that power line was in the area of this fire.

Another thing I want you to hear about, and I think that the Aspen Group needs to spend more time thinking about, is as we know pollution has no borders. And we all know that our investor owned utility has a Mexico power plant and that pollution is going into Imperial Valley. I think we need to do a lot of research on the amount of asthma that's occurring in Imperial Valley.

Now, the reason I'm up here is to let you all know, you probably all heard from me earlier today, I've been passing out a flier. I think if we quit talking about South County and North County and we start talking about how we group together. This is the San Diego Foundation. They have a couple of billion dollars of money that they take care of for people for certain types of not-for-profit reasons. Protect our communities is to protect us. I'm telling you that we — you know, we had — I want to quote something here. Every environmental victory is temporary, but every environmental loss is permanent. If we ban together and quit looking at maps and consider financing a way to fight this, which is through this. My name is on it. You can reach me. I'll put you on my group e-mail list. We could beat this one way or the other.

The way we've done is we put together environmental groups with land owners, and I'm a land owner, and we are grouping together. We decided to go to the dance together, but we're not going to go home together. We are going to fight this together on this event and then we're going to go off and do our thing. This will be around after the power line is decided upon. And that's to protect us all and I hope you all consider joining. Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thanks, Denis. Our next speakers are Randy Rusch, Patricia Akers and Kathe Myrick. Randy Rusch.

MR. RUSCH: Good evening. I'm here as a land owner and resident here of Alpine. And going through this, I've been kind of reading up on some of the things that you've put out in the newspaper, San Diego Union, various things like that. As many people have said they read in the paper, I've read too, San Diego Gas & Electric is thinking about shutting down our South Bay Power Plant. If that's the reason, folks, why are we trying to get power in from down there to feed into there is just — is this going to be a quick alternative to get power from Mexico through San Diego County up to L.A. and to

Northern California and tie in with Southern California Edison? I'm just curious. I'm just going to throw that out there. Just one of the things that came to my mind.

You talk about the environmental impact, I haven't really heard anything as far as what you're going to do during the construction phase, how you're going to handle that. Obviously nothing is put in the package on that. Structural requirements of these towers, what are we looking at seismic building codes and various things like that? Obviously 100 — one gentleman said 160-foot tower is going to require quite a foundation in there. These power lines, whatever routes you go by according to the map are going to have to have some severe depth foundation sunk into the ground. How is that going to affect your groundwater? Has there ever been a survey done on water tables around the surrounding area? If we start going down, is that going to affect somebody's well. Maybe not on the property that you buy from them, but what the personal owner that's maybe a mile down the road, how is that going to affect them? I mean, I would sure hate to be a property owner out here, have a power line two miles away and all of a sudden my well dries up.

The next thing is as many people said as far as fire fighting and stuff like that. One of the things, I didn't see anything in here, is was anything done as far as the FAA, doing any surveys there? How is that going to affect the flight patterns coming into Lindbergh Field and also all of the small, like Ramona, going into El Cajon and various places like that? And some of the people have also said their concerns about the fire fighting, which if that does affect that, how — I mean, how is that going to affect that.

And, of course, then my last concern is I've been a victim of both of the fires, we have gone through Viejas and the Cedar Fire, and I'm really concerned about that. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MS. AKERS: Hello, my name is Patricia Akers. And I would like to address a couple of issues and I think that the EIS needs to be addressed itself and the EIR. The no-line alternative, I believe, is the best alternative. It should not be eliminated. In fact, it should be a prime, a prime choice of this Environmental Impact Report and it should definitely be a portion of your social impact. Your social impact assessment must include how this type of project, first of all, pits communities against one another. You have one community saying place it through here. You're having another community saying place it up north. You have someone saying, well, currently there's a route through Crest. Crest was so heavily impacted by the fire. My area in Harbison Canyon in the last fire was devastated. You're essentially setting us up for further fires and it's inappropriate. And you are actually pitting communities against one another. That is inappropriate action.

We have an area all the way across the eastern section of San Diego County that essentially is sensitive. And it starts in our area beginning in El Cajon going across Crest and then it starts all the way backwards moving to the east.

We have alternatives such as commercial solar energy. It currently is an excellent methodology of generating electricity. And what has not occurred is I have not seen SDG&E really concentrating or spending money in this manner, nor have I seen the PUC really encouraging them to do so. These communities are getting fed up. We have power lines going through our backyards.

I served on the Crest, Dehesa, Harbison Canyon, Granite Hills, Harbison Canyon Planning Group for years. We were told that this power line was the last power line that was going to go through

our community and that that would be the — and that we had mitigation to that effect. That mitigation is being ignored.

And you are again placing these communities into pitting themselves up against one another. Please, recognize the social impact is great. You are taking and allowing SDG&E to take us from a conservation ethic into a wasteful ethic in which we are continually relying upon outside imported energy sources for the San Diego County. It is inappropriate. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Kathe Myrick.

MS. MYRICK: Hi, I'm Kathe Myrick and I'm here to oppose the West of Forest Alternative. That's WF-17, 18, 19, 20 specifically. I just wanted to say I know that we brought up the fire protection in the canyon and in Crest before, but I was one of the people who lost my home during the fire. And it's really hard to go through with a 13-year-old and a 10-year-old and explain to them the whole concept of why the firefighters were sitting up above the canyon and why the firefighters didn't feel safe going into the canyon to fight the fire. And historically this happened in the '40s, in the '70s, and again in 2003, so we know it's going to happen again. There's a precedent for it happening and nobody has brought that up. We know these fires come out and we know that this will happen again. And if we put those power lines in the realm of making it so we can't have any fire protection from the air, you're taking away the only fire protection we have. So, please, I'd really like to see it as not one of the alternatives. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you. If you have not already spoken but you would like to and you haven't turned in a card yet, we still want to hear from you. So if you want to come up to the mike and take a turn, I'll just ask you to fill out a card. Is that you, sir, you're one of those people?

MR. ELLIOTT: I did fill out a card, but you called my name to stand up but then you didn't call me to speak, so I just figured I would say something at the end.

MR. MICHAELSON: What is your name?

MR. ELLIOTT: John Elliott. I live in Descanso. I've lived here all my life. You know, the discussions regarding in-area generation or we should build some solar things or geothermal out in the desert and, you know, those alternatives, I have no idea. I'm not smart enough to figure those things out. I don't have the facts, figures to crunch the numbers to really make a determination. But if we are going to build something out in the desert to provide power for this area, the utility route it's got to go through the desert. It's needs to go up through Anza-Borrego where it's going to be the least impactive to all the communities and the people involved. You know, they created wilderness zones immediately adjacent to these 500 kV lines, placing a 500 kV line within a wilderness area through a corridor, if they put one next to it, they should be able to put one within it.

As an alternative to that, I would suggest using the existing, the Southwest Powerlink, where that 500 kV power line runs. These proposals, the I-8 alternative, the BCD alternative and the Route D alternatives are completely unacceptable. The traffic impacts, the community impacts, the visual impacts, running those things through this area up through Boulder Creek Road through the Descanso area are unacceptable.

One of the impacts, one of the previous speakers touched on it, is some of the construction impacts of this. The I-8 impact with the traffic, we get heavy desert traffic every year. This is probably going to take several years to build. It's going to be a real, real mess for years to come with traffic along those roads.

Also through the Descanso area if we run that Alternative D, Boulder Creek Road has portions of it that have been paved, that pavement is not going to stand up to the heavy trucks going in and out every day. And there would have to be some sort of repaving as part of that alternative.

Also, as part of the construction things, down off — there's another Sycamore Canyon area off Highway 94. There was recent acquisition by the BLM. SDG&E was recently doing some repair work on their 500 kV line through that area and as a result of their construction activities, they created some off-site impacts. BLM has blamed some of the recreational users up there and they had an interim closer area and we're trying to get everything sorted out. That's a real big issue, this off-site impacts in construction.

And I just think that the primary route through the park area would be the best. And, like I say, as an alternative run that through the Southwest an adjacent line down through the border. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thanks. Come on up.

MR. LUTZ: Hello, name is Raymond Lutz. I live in El Cajon, but in the county. I'm in the county area. What I find interesting, and I haven't been studying this for a long time is I think a lot of people make this known as well, is that things are going in the wrong order. We're looking at all these routes, most of them are bogus, just put out for red herrings to pull off. You guys are great at taking notes and listening, but I've been to things like this before, it mostly winds of being appeasement of population and SDG&E runs ahead and do whatever the hell they want. These systems have been set up for years. All these CPUC, they're all in bed with these power generation firms. And why haven't we had a discussion about whether we need this or not? Where is all the documentation? Is it allowed that we request the analysis for why we need this powerlink? That's not in the documentation here.

Now all these people sitting out here are going to feel very appeased and they're not going to do anything. We have the wrong people sitting up in front. You guys are not even the right people to talk to. You're the wrong people here tonight. We need people from SDG&E, the people that are making the first decision. You're the wrong folks. So what do we get, really nothing, except maybe a good warm and fuzzy feeling at the end of the night. Hopefully the population you guys think go home and forget about really sticking up for yourself. I'll tell you, guys, we've got to get together and really stop it, because these people will do nothing. Thank you.

MS. DAVIS: I'm Shannon Davis. I spoke earlier today. I want everyone here to be aware of the fact that there have been San Diego Gas & Electric meetings at the planning groups. Interestingly enough every planning group has weighed in on this that is along the alternative routes except for Alpine. Alpine is getting to the party kind of late. But every planning group has been in solidarity of being opposed to the Sunrise Powerlink, every single route, A, B, C or D at first, because that's what we had to study. And in that packet they spelled out that it was going to be 300 feet they were taking through our 30-foot right-of-ways. They spelled out they were going to go 40 feet deep. They spelled out how tall it was going to go. They addressed a number of issues, so some of you speaking tonight are coming to the party late. You don't know the whole picture. And I appreciate what you had to say, but I'm also feeling that they have taken the time to come here and to listen to our comments and that we need to show them a little respect on this process. They're trying to find some other alternatives to what we've already debated and said we don't like about the alternatives.

The whole issue of Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, we've already put comments in on. That's why California Public Utilities and BLM came back and said not good enough, let's have some alternatives. So that's the issue tonight. What are the alternatives and none of them are good.

And at this point I called Diane Jacobs office this afternoon in response to this next session of scoping and she had now put out another letter to the California Public Utilities opposing this, any alternatives. So I — in solidarity with all the planning groups. No one is saying not in my backyard, over there. It's not like that. We're all opposing everything.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you, Shannon. We did mention that we wanted to reserve some time, if possible, to go back to the maps and answer specific questions that people have and we're ready and willing and able to do that when you are, but is there anyone else who wanted to speak tonight? Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm just wondering what the follow-up is after the meetings?

MR. MICHAELSON: Tell you what, why don't we do a little next steps piece, either Susan, or do you want to talk about next steps and then we'll adjourn? Who wants to take that just so they know what comes next in case they missed that?

MS. BLANCHARD: This week we're taking in a lot of input from people on these alternatives and also more information about the proposed route as well. So we've got to take that back and sort of regroup in our team and look at what we've got and where we're going to go from there. But the next step is to try to decide on what alternatives we actually are going to carry forward and what we're going to eliminate based on all the addition feedback that we're getting from people. And then we have to go about doing our very big impact analysis on both the proposed project and the alternatives that we carry forward. So that's really the next steps for us.

As far as the general proceeding, that's on another track going on at the same time with the administrative law judge and there's a lot of parties in that proceeding. And they are going to be dealing with the need issues and there's going to be hearings and all of that is taking place in the spring and the summer. So there's a lot of things yet to be done. And as far as we're concerned we're sort of at the beginning this process. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much for coming tonight. We hope you will stay involved throughout the process. And with that we're going to adjourn and allow the people to go back to the maps and ask specific questions.

Thank you for coming.

(Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 8:16 p.m.)